

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123554
Title of the Manuscript:	Management of Powdery mildew (<i>Erysiphe polygoni</i>) of fenugreek
Type of the Article	Research article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)																																																														
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fenugreek is a major seed spice crop cultivated in Gujarat, and powdery mildew is a devastating disease that can cause reductions of up to 100%. This manuscript provides valuable field data from three seasons, showing consistent trends and identifying the best treatments that can be used in farmer fields for disease management. 																																																															
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title is very common, it need to specify, below is the alternative title Exploring Fungicides for the management of powdery mildew (<i>Erysiphe polygoni</i>) in fenugreek</p>																																																															
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Abstract is comprehensive, but poorly written. Below is the corrected version of abstract, if editors agree to accept.</p> <p>Fenugreek (<i>Trigonella foenum-graecum</i> L.) is a vital spice crop in India. However, powdery mildew, caused by <i>Erysiphe polygoni</i> DC, is a major disease that reduces its yield. To assess the effectiveness of different fungicides against this disease, a field experiment was conducted during the Rabi seasons from 2019 to 2022. Six fungicides, along with a water spray and an untreated control, were tested for their efficacy under field conditions. All fungicides significantly reduced the disease intensity compared to the control. Among them, hexaconazole (0.005%) at 1 ml/l showed the lowest disease intensity at maturity (29.25%), followed by propiconazole (0.025%) at 1 ml/l with 31.23%, and wettable sulfur (0.2%) at 2.5 g/l with 33.07%. The highest net returns were recorded with hexaconazole 5% EC (Rs. 20,198/ha) and an ICBR of 1:6.23, followed by propiconazole 25% EC with a net return of Rs. 16,568/ha and an ICBR of 1:5.26, and sulfur 80% WP with a net return of Rs. 14,858/ha and an ICBR of 1:5.24.</p>																																																															
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p>																																																															
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript includes valuable field data from three seasons and demonstrates consistent effectiveness of treatments over this period. This provides a clear understanding of disease management. The fungicides used, which belong to the triazole group, are effective against powdery mildew. The manuscript having good field data but the article is not properly written Make separate table of each season, to get clear idea <p>e.g. Field evaluation of fungicides for the management of fenugreek powdery mildew 2019-20</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="845 1480 1982 1659"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Tr. No.</th> <th rowspan="2">Name of Treatments</th> <th rowspan="2">Concentrations (a. i %)</th> <th rowspan="2">Quantity (g or ml/l)</th> <th colspan="4">PDI</th> <th rowspan="2">Yield Kg/ha)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Before 1st spray</th> <th>15 days after 1st Spray</th> <th>15 days after 2nd Spray</th> <th>At maturity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Table No. 4, the word 'pooled' is already mentioned in the table title; avoid repeating it in the table. <table border="1" data-bbox="845 1717 1982 1890"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Tr. No.</th> <th rowspan="2">Name of Treatments</th> <th rowspan="2">Concentrations (a. i %)</th> <th rowspan="2">Quantity (g or ml/l)</th> <th colspan="4">PDI</th> <th rowspan="2">Yield Kg/ha)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Before 1st spray</th> <th>15 days after 1st Spray</th> <th>15 days after 2nd Spray</th> <th>At maturity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Tr. No.	Name of Treatments	Concentrations (a. i %)	Quantity (g or ml/l)	PDI				Yield Kg/ha)	Before 1st spray	15 days after 1st Spray	15 days after 2nd Spray	At maturity	1.									2.									Tr. No.	Name of Treatments	Concentrations (a. i %)	Quantity (g or ml/l)	PDI				Yield Kg/ha)	Before 1st spray	15 days after 1st Spray	15 days after 2nd Spray	At maturity	1.									2.									
Tr. No.	Name of Treatments					Concentrations (a. i %)	Quantity (g or ml/l)	PDI				Yield Kg/ha)																																																				
		Before 1st spray	15 days after 1st Spray	15 days after 2nd Spray	At maturity																																																											
1.																																																																
2.																																																																
Tr. No.	Name of Treatments	Concentrations (a. i %)	Quantity (g or ml/l)	PDI				Yield Kg/ha)																																																								
				Before 1st spray	15 days after 1st Spray	15 days after 2nd Spray	At maturity																																																									
1.																																																																
2.																																																																

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The references are old and not sufficient for this manuscript• Add recent references. If a reference for the same crop is not available, use a cross-reference of the same pathogen causing the same disease in other crops."	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No. The quality of the language needs to improve.• This language is not suitable for scholarly communication• Check grammar	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ranapratap Anaji Raut
Department, University & Country	Dr.BSKKV, India